

view of Teicher. Claims 9 and 20 have been rejected as unpatentable over Hohle in view of Taylor. Claims 10 and 21 have been rejected as unpatentable over Hohle in view of Chen.

Independent claim 1 defines a system for managing a plurality of local lists of a single user. The plurality of local lists is located at a plurality of remote appliances. Each appliance holds a corresponding local list and includes a card reader. The system comprises a compact user-carried smart card including a microprocessor and a memory storing a master list. The master list is configured for synchronizing with each local list. Specifically, the microprocessor is programmed to synchronize the master list with a local list on a remote appliance when the smart card is engaged with the remote appliance card reader to allow the user to carry the smart card with the master list stored in the smart card memory to various remote appliances and synchronize the master list with the various local lists of the appliances.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as anticipated by Hohle. Independent claim 1 recites each appliance holding a corresponding local list and including a card reader. Independent claim 1 further recites that the microprocessor is programmed to synchronize the master list with a local list on a remote appliance when the smart card is engaged with the remote appliance card reader. That is, the compact user-carried smart card may be carried by the user to various remote appliances and the master list may be synchronized with the various local lists of the appliances that include card readers. It is appreciated that the local lists are at the appliances, allowing the smart card to act as a token for the user, carrying the master list to each appliance for synchronization with the local list at that appliance when the smart card is received in the card reader. Hohle fails to describe or suggest remote appliances holding corresponding local lists with each remote appliance including a card reader and a microprocessor program to synchronize the master list with a local list of a remote appliance when a smart card is engaged with the remote appliance card reader.

Hohle is directed to the more general smart card use which includes the use of a smart card for synchronizing data on the smart card with data in remote databases. That is, card readers are located in various locations, however, the remote database is not located at each card reader but rather is located at a corporate partner of the smart card provider. In the

more traditional smart card system of Hohle, data on the smart card is synchronized with data in the remote database such as a database at a corporate partner. In contrast, the present invention comprehends a new use for a smart card. For the new use, each appliance holds a corresponding local list and includes a card reader and the microprocessor on the smart card is programmed to synchronize the master list with a local list on a remote appliance when the smart card is engaged with the remote appliance card reader. Applicant is claiming a new use for a smart card and points out that independent claim 1 recites that the microprocessor is programmed to synchronize the master list with a local list on a remote appliance when the smart card is engaged with the remote appliance card reader. Hohle does not describe or suggest the claimed invention of claim 1.

Applicants remaining independent claims, namely, independent claims 11 and 22, use similar language to recite that each appliance holds a corresponding local list and includes a card reader, and that the microprocessor is programmed to synchronize the master list with a local list on the remote appliance when the smart card is engaged with the remote appliance card reader. For these reasons, independent claims 11 and 22 are also believed to be patentable. The remaining claims are dependent claims that are also believed to be patentable for reasons explained above. In addition, the remaining relied upon references fail to describe or suggest the elements of independent claims 1, 11 and 22 that are lacked by Hohle.

Further, regarding the Examiner's statement that claims 2, 12, and 24 are rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hohle, applicant disagrees. First, the Examiner states that Hohle teaches the synchronizing of the data between the smart card and the remote appliance. Applicant disagrees, Hohle synchronizes data on the smart card with data in a remote database such as a database at a corporate partner, which is far different than the synchronizing of data between the smart card and the remote appliance as claimed by applicant. Second, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adapt the notoriously old and well known display and the card reader to the teachings of Hohle. Applicant disagrees and maintains that the subject matter of claims 2, 12, and 24 is not obvious in view of Hohle. Specifically, Hohle

operates in a far different way than the claimed invention, and applicant believes that the Examiner is misinterpreting the teachings of Hohle. Properly interpreted, Hohle does not describe or suggest the claimed invention, and it is not obvious to modify Hohle to achieve the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider this application, and allow pending claims 1-24. If there is any uncertainty as to the patentability of the claimed invention, a telephone call to the undersigned is invited.

Respectfully submitted,

Yvonne Ng

By



Jeremy J. Curcun

Reg. No. 42,454

Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 18, 2001

BROOKS & KUSHMAN P.C.

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor

Southfield, MI 48075

Phone: 248-358-4400

Fax: 248-358-3351